



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

BC2

BC2

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

09/306,038

05/06/99

RUDY

C

ROA88957

LM01/0822

JOSEPH S. TRIPOLI  
THOMSON MULTIMEDIA LICENSING INC.  
PO BOX 5312  
PRINCETON NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

TRAN, Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2743

DATE MAILED:

08/22/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/306,038

Applicant(s)

Rudd et al

Examiner

Quoc D. Tran

Group Art Unit  
2743
☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 6, 1999
☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2743

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claims 3 and 4 are objected to because of the following informalities: the dependency of claim 3 should be depending on claim "1" and dependency of claim 5 should be depending on claim "4". Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1, and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Han (5,991,397).

Consider claim 1, Han teaches a method for providing an one-way communication among a selected group of telephones in a telephone system having a plurality of telephones (col. 1 lines 15-23), comprising the steps of assigning a group number to each of the plurality of telephones; selecting a group number at a paging telephone selected from the plurality of telephones (col. 1 lines 34-38, col. 2 lines 7-10, col. 4 lines 54-58); and causing a one-way communication to be

Art Unit: 2743

automatically setup through voice channel of the telephone system to a group of telephone having the selected group number (col. 1 lines 59-63, col. 2 lines 32-50, col. 6 line 46-57).

Consider claim 3, Han teaches the step of converting the broadcast communication to a two-way voice communication by answering the page (see col. 7 lines 2-9).

Consider claims 4-5, Han teaches where the one-way voice communication is set up via a data packet and wherein the data packet comprising a number corresponding to the selected group number (col. 6 lines 64-65).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han (5,991,397) in view of Khojasteh (5,699,417).

Consider claim 2, Han teaches that the information about the caller (i.e., caller ID) is broadcasted (col. 4 lines 17-19). Han failed to suggest of displaying the information about the caller. However, Khojasteh teaches the method for transmitting caller information in telephone system and displaying the information thereto (col. 2 line 18-24 and lines 36-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2743

to incorporate the teaching of Khojasteh into view of Han in order to address the caller information in the form of data instead of voice.

6. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han (5,991,397).

Consider claim 6, Han teaches that the one-way communication is convert into a two-way communication upon the paged subscriber's device goes off-hook. Han failed to specify that another data packet is initiated to perform the two-way communication. However, the examiner take official notice that it is obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to acknowledge that another data packet is initiated in order to direct the processing unit to convert the broadcast call into a two-way conversation.

Consider claims 7-8, Han teaches a timer for setting a predetermined period for the one-way communication response (see col. 5 line 52-63). Han failed to suggest the step of terminating the one-way communication when the paging telephone is on-hook or when the predetermined time has expired. However, the examiner take official notice that one of the ordinary skill in the art would acknowledge that when the caller place the telephone on an on-hook condition when the predetermined time has expired, the communication is terminated. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of terminating the communication when the paging telephone is on-hook.

Consider claim 9, the limitation "...selected group comprises all telephones in the system" is a well known feature such as "page all" or "intercom all". Therefore, it is obvious to one of the

Art Unit: 2743

ordinary skill in the art include the all the telephones of the system in a group in order to broadcast a message to all the phones connected within.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turnbull et al (6,046,995) in view of Heep et al (4,996,709).

Turnbull et al teach a method of providing paging feature in a communication system having no central control comprising the step of selecting a group comprising more than one communication units at a first communication unit in the system and establishing full-duplex communication from the first communication unit to the group of communication units in response to a user request (col. 1 lines 45-55 and col. 3 lines 14-19).

Turnbull et al failed to suggest a half-duplex channel for communication. However, Heep et al teach an intercom system where communication can be established in half-duplex or full-duplex mode (col. 1 lines 53-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Heep et al into view Turnbull et al in order to provide different modes of communication.

8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han (5,991,397) in view of Heep et al (4,996,709).

Consider claim 11, Han teaches a multi line telephone system for providing paging feature comprising a first telephone for selecting a group of telephone in the system (col. 1 lines 20-22, and col. 6 lines 46-49); a first telephone initiate a voice message to the group of telephone; and

Art Unit: 2743

the group of telephones receives and play the voice message from the first telephone automatically regardless of user action (col. 7 lines 2-9).

Han failed to suggest a half-duplex channel for communication. However, Heep et al teach an intercom system where communication can be established in half-duplex or full-duplex mode (col. 1 lines 53-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Heep et al into view Han in order to provide different modes of communication.

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Washington, D.C. 20231**

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 308-6306, (for formal communications intended for entry)**

**Or:**

**(703) 308-6296 (for informal or draft communications, please label**

**"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")**

Art Unit: 2743

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5643**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Curtis Kuntz**, can be reached on **(703) 305-4708**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-4700**.

  
**CURTIS A. KUNTZ**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 2700**